1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FLETCHER: Good morning, your Honor, Kiersten Fletcher, Robert Sobelman, and Sheb Swett for the government.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Good morning, your Honor, Priya
Chaudhry and Seth Zuckerman for Ms. Shah, who is present and
standing between us.

THE COURT: Good morning. You may be seated in the courtroom.

I understand you have an application, Ms. Chaudhry?

MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor. At this time Ms. Shah would like to withdraw her plea of not guilty and enter into a plea of guilty to the first count in the indictment.

THE COURT: I take it it's pursuant to a document I find on my bench, dated July 10, which I take it is the plea agreement in this action?

MS. CHAUDHRY: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Blake, please administer the oath to the defendant.

(Defendant sworn)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your full name and spell your name for the record.

THE DEFENDANT: Jennifer Keikilani, K-e-i-k-i-l-a-n-i, Shah, S-h-a-h.

THE COURT: Ms. Shah, do you understand that you are

if you answer any of my questions  antrue answers may later be used against  con for perjury or for making a false  Yes, your Honor.  Told are you, ma'am?  Forty-eight years old.  The far did you go in school?  Two years of college.  E you able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.  E you now or have you recently been
Yes, your Honor.  Yold are you, ma'am?  Forty-eight years old.  Yar did you go in school?  Two years of college.  Yes, your Honor.
Yes, your Honor.  Yold are you, ma'am?  Forty-eight years old.  Yes are did you go in school?  Two years of college.  You able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Forty-eight years old.  Far did you go in school?  Two years of college.  You able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Forty-eight years old.  Far did you go in school?  Two years of college.  You able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Forty-eight years old.  If ar did you go in school?  Two years of college.  You able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Two years of college.  e you able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Two years of college.  e you able to read, write, speak, and  Yes, your Honor.
Yes, your Honor.
Yes, your Honor.
· · ·
· · ·
e you now or have you recently been
1 1
tor or a psychiatrist?
No.
ve you ever been treated or hospitalized
or any type of addiction, including drug
Yes.
en was that?
Two years ago.
s it inpatient?
No, your Honor.
at was it for?
it was it for:

MR. ZUCKERMAN: No, your Honor.

25

1 THE COURT: Ms. Shah, you heard Ms. Chaudhry a moment 2 ago tell me that you wish to enter a plea of quilty to Count 3 One of the indictment against you in this action. Is that true? Do you wish to enter a plea of quilty to Count One? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss 6 7 your case with Ms. Chaudhry and with Mr. Zuckerman and to 8 discuss the consequences of your entering a plea of quilty 9 today with them? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I have. 11 THE COURT: Are you satisfied -- I'm sorry. I didn't 12 mean to cut you off. 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 14 THE COURT: Are you satisfied with your attorneys and 15 their representation of you? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: On the basis of Ms. Shah's responses to my 18 questions and my observations of her demeanor as she stands 19 here before me and as she has appeared in this courtroom in 20 this action on prior occasions, I make the finding that she is 21 fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time. 22 Before I accept a plea from you, Ms. Shah, I am going 23 to be asking you certain questions, and those questions are 24 intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because

you are guilty and that you fully understand the consequences

25

of entering a plea of guilty.

I am going to be describing to you certain rights you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and you are going to be giving up those rights if you enter a plea of guilty today.

I need you to listen to me carefully, Ms. Shah. If you do not understand anything I'm saying to you or you do not understand anything I'm asking you, I want you to stop me. You can ask me anything you want. You can ask your attorneys anything you want. My concern is to make certain that you understand what I'm asking you and that you understand what I'm saying to you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, Ms. Shah, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in indictment S4 19 CR 833. Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove you were innocent at a trial. Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty. Do you understand that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have a right to be represented by an attorney at your trial and at every stage of the proceeding.

If you cannot afford an attorney, one would be given to you at no cost to you. Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have a right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your own behalf, if you so desired, and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense. Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you'd have the right to testify you if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify if you did not want to and, in addition, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you decided not to testify at your trial. Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: You understand that by entering a plea of quilty today in this courtroom, you will be giving up every one 2 3 of the rights I have been listing, you're waiving those rights 4 and that you will have no trial. 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand you have the right to 6 7 change your mind right now, Ms. Shah, and you can refuse to 8 enter a plea of guilty. You don't have to enter a plea of 9 quilty this morning if you do not want to, for any reason 10 whatsoever. Do you understand that? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Have you received a copy of the indictment 13 in this case against you? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Did you read it? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. 17 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorneys? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I did discuss it. 19 THE COURT: Did -- again, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to 20 cut you off. 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I did discuss it, and 22 they answered all of my questions. 23 THE COURT: You have the right to have me read the 24 indictment out loud now in open court. But if you don't want

25

me to read it, I won't.

1 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, we waive the public 2 reading. 3 THE COURT: Is that true, Ms. Shah, you don't want me 4 to read it? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I accept that as a knowing and voluntary 6 THE COURT: 7 waiver of the right to have the indictment read in open court. 8 You understand you are charged in Count One with 9 participating in a conspiracy to commit wire fraud in 10 connection with the conduct of telemarketing, in violation of 11 18, United States Code, Sections 1349 and 2326. Do you understand that? 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Do you understand that if you did not 15 plead guilty, the government would have to prove each and every 16 part or element of the charge in Count One beyond a reasonable 17 doubt at a trial. Do you understand that? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Ms. Fletcher, would you set forth the 20 elements that the government would have to prove beyond a 21 reasonable doubt before a jury would be entitled to convict 22 Ms. Shah of Count One. 23 MS. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor.

> SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

would be required to prove the two elements of Title 18, United

Were the defendant to proceed to trial, the government

24

25

States Code, Section 1349. The first element is that the defendant agreed with others to violate the law. The second element is that the defendant entered the agreement knowingly and willfully. Here, the object of Count One is the agreement to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

Wire fraud, under Section 1343, has six elements:

First, that the defendant engaged in a scheme to defraud;

second, that he or she do so by means of false or fraudulent

pretenses or statements; third, that those false statements

relate to material facts; fourth, that the misstatements were

made in an effort to obtain money or property; fifth, that the

defendant intended to defraud victims of the crime; and,

finally, that the wire fraud crime involved the use of

interstate wires; that is, the wires between the states.

Because Count One as charged also includes an enhancement for telemarketing under Title 18, United States Code, Section 2326, the government would also be required to prove that the wire fraud conspiracy involved the conduct of telemarketing and that it involved more than 10 victims over the age of 55.

The elements I have just articulated, the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, the government would have to show venue is proper in the Southern District of New York by a preponderance of the

1 evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Shah, do you understand that with the exception of venue requirement, the elements that Ms. Fletcher set forth would have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt to the jury before the jury could convict you of Count One. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And the burden that the government has on the venue requirement is simply to prove that venue is proper, meaning at least one act in connection with the alleged conspiracy took place in the Southern District of New York.

But that has to be proved by the government simply by a preponderance of the evidence, not beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum possible penalty of Count One to which you are pleading guilty is 30 years in prison, a maximum term of supervised release of five years, maximum fine, pursuant to 18, United States Code, Section 3571 of the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 mandatory special assessment. Do you understand that?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that I must order restitution to those injured as a result of your criminal conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, when I was setting forth the various aspects of the maximum penalty here, I mentioned that a part of that was a maximum term of supervised release of five years. Supervised release, Ms. Shah, means that you are going to be subject to monitoring upon your release from prison, and that monitoring will be under terms and conditions that could lead to your reimprisonment without a jury trial for all or part of the term of supervised release and without credit for time previously served on postrelease supervision if you violate any term or condition of your supervised release. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if I accept your guilty plea this morning, ma'am, and determine you to be guilty, that determination may deprive you of such valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess a firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, I gather your client is a

United States citizen, is that correct?

MS. CHAUDHRY: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Shah, there are sentencing guidelines that judges must utilize in applying the factors set forth in 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a) to determine what a fair, reasonable, and appropriate sentence is in your case. Have you talked to your attorneys about the sentencing guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I have.

THE COURT: Do you understand I won't be able to determine what the relevant guideline range is until after a presentence report has been completed by the probation office and you and the government and your attorneys have had a full opportunity to challenge any of the facts reported by the probation office?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if I accept your guilty plea this morning, you will be interviewed by the probation department.

Ms. Chaudhry and Mr. Zuckerman can be there, if they so wish.

It's important that you give the probation department accurate and complete and truthful information. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because I am going to use that report in determining what an appropriate sentence is for you. As I just told you, Ms. Chaudhry will be able to object to any findings

of fact in the presentence report. The government will have the same opportunity. If there are objections, I then will adjudicate the objections. So it is important that you give them accurate information. It's a quite thorough report. Your sentencing is going to be put off for a few months in order, in part, for the probation department to prepare that, and also for your attorneys to submit a sentencing submission and for the government to do so.

But the point here is, when they interview you, be truthful with them. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: On the basis of that probation department presentence report and my reading of the law, and the submissions of the parties, I'll be able to determine what the relevant guideline range is that applies to your case. But even after I do that, I have the ability to impose a sentence based on a departure from the guidelines, in other words, I can sentence you to something greater than that's called for by the guidelines or I can sentence you to something less than that called for by the guidelines on the basis of a departure from the guidelines. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even after I do that, that is, even after I determine first what the appropriate guideline range is and then determine whether there are grounds to depart either

upward or downward from the guideline range on the basis of a departure, I then have to apply all of the factors in 18,

United States Code, Section 3553(a) to determine whether I should vary from the guideline range. Do you understand that?

In other words, sentence you to something that's less than the guideline range or, I take it, more than the guideline range, on the basis of the variance, but certainly the normal variance is something below the guideline range. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that when you're sentenced to prison, the system of parole that used to exist in the federal criminal justice system has been abolished. So that when I sentence to you prison, ma'am, you are going to serve that entire term in prison. There is a system whereby you can be released a bit earlier on good-time credits, if you follow all the rules and regulations of the correctional facility where you're located, but you will not be released any earlier on parole. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if your attorney or anyone else has attempted to estimate or predict what your sentence will be that their estimation or prediction could be wrong? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you yourself think you know what your sentence is going to be, you can be wrong as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The reason for that is, I'm the one who is going to sentence you, Ms. Shah, and I don't know what your sentence is going to be. I just simply don't know enough about you, about your upbringing, about your financial situation, about your educational background, your business background, any criminal history you may have. I know essentially nothing about that. So I don't know what your sentence is going to be. And if I don't know what your sentence is going to be, and I'm the one who is going to sentence you, nobody can know what your sentence going is to be. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if I do sentence you to something that you are not expecting or something that people have told you you are not going to receive, in other words, if it's different from what you're expecting or what other people have told you you are going to receive, you still are going to be bound to this guilty plea, Ms. Shah, and you won't be allowed to withdraw it. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I referred to the document that's on my bench at the beginning of this procedure. It's dated July

1 It's addressed to yourself and several lawyers at 2 ChaudhryLaw. It has an Exhibit A attached to it. And the 3 letter itself is six pages. It appears to be signed by 4 Mr. Swett, and there is what looks like your signature and 5 perhaps Ms. Chaudhry's signature, although that's a little 6 harder to understand. It's illegible. I'll show it to you, 7 Ms. Chaudhry. You can tell me if it's your signature. 8 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor, it is signed by Ms. Shah and me. 9 10 THE COURT: I am going to ask my deputy to mark this 11 as Government Exhibit 1, and I am going to ask her to show you 12 the signature page. 13 Ms. Shah, is that your signature? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, I think you told me you 16 signed it as well? 17 MS. CHAUDHRY: That's correct. 18 THE COURT: Did you read that agreement, Ms. Shah, 19 before you signed it? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I did. 21 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Ms. Chaudhry and 22 Mr. Zuckerman before you signed it? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Did you understand it, ma'am, at the time

25

you signed it?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did Ms. Chaudhry or Mr. Zuckerman answer any questions you may have had before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. They answered all my questions.

THE COURT: Does this letter agreement, Government

Exhibit Number 1, constitute your complete and total

understanding of your entire agreement between the government,

your attorneys, and yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is everything about your plea and sentence contained in this agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything that's been left out?

Are there any side deals or other arrangements that I should know about?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements,

Ms. Shah, or threatened you or forced you to plead guilty or to
enter into the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, in the plea agreement the parties have stipulated that the appropriate guideline range is 135 to 168 months' imprisonment. In other words, the bottom of the guidelines calls for a sentence of more than 11 years and the

top of the guidelines calls for a sentence of 14 years. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the determination of what the guideline range is is not for the parties to make and it's not for the probation department to make. It's for the Court to make. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So that my determination of the appropriate guideline range may be different than this 135 to 168 months stipulated guideline range. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, take a look at page 2 of the plea agreement, both parties, and, in paragraph 7, I think there is just a typographical error. I am not sure. It says: Sentencing of the instance offense. I think that should simply be instant offense. Is that right?

MS. FLETCHER: Yes, that's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, do you agree?

MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't see any need to change it as long as it's on the record. Let's not go through changing a simple typographical error.

Do you understand, Ms. Shah, that in this agreement you have agreed not to file a direct appeal from the sentence

and you have agreed not to bring a collateral challenge to the sentence if I sentenced you to 168 months in prison or fewer months.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement you've admitted the forfeiture allegation with respect to Count One and agreed to forfeit to the United States \$6,500,000 in United States currency?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement you've also agreed to make restitution to the victims of your criminal conduct in the amount of \$9,500,000?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you have agreed to waive any defense based on the statute of limitations with respect to any prosecution that's not time barred by today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, are you aware of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or know of any reason why Ms. Shah should not be permitted to plead guilty?

MS. CHAUDHRY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there an adequate factual basis, in your view, ma'am, to support your client's plea?

MS. CHAUDHRY: There is.

THE COURT: Ms. Fletcher, is there an adequate factual

basis to support the defendant's plea this morning?

MS. FLETCHER: There is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Shah, I am now going to ask you what you did that makes you guilty of Count One of this indictment.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I prepared a statement that she will be reading from.

THE COURT: Ms. Shah, perfectly permissible for your lawyer to have worked with you in preparing the statement you want to make, but what I need to hear from you is that what you are about to tell me is true.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you tell me now what you did.

Read slowly. When people are nervous and they read, they tend to read rather quickly, and I need the reporter to be able to take it down. I need to be able to process what you're telling me.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

From 2012 to March 2021, in the Southern District of
New York and elsewhere, I agreed with others to commit wire
fraud. I did this by knowingly providing customer names to
people who were marketing business services that had little or
no value. However, I knew the purchasers of these services
were misled about the value and that's why they bought the
services. We used interstate telephones and e-mails to market
and sell these services. Furthermore, while doing this, I knew

many of the purchasers of these services were over the age of 55.

THE COURT: Were more than 20 people over the age of 55? I don't know what the statutory amount is. I think 20, I believe. I'm asking the defendant.

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I believe the statute requires more than 10.

THE COURT: More than 10.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes. Your Honor, we had done enough diligence to be able to say for sure that there were more than 10.

THE COURT: But I would like to hear that from the client.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, more than 10.

THE COURT: Now, you said something, this is why they bought whatever it is they bought. What were you referring to? What was the reason they bought what they were buying?

THE DEFENDANT: The misrepresentations of the product is why they purchased the service.

THE COURT: What were the misrepresentations?

THE DEFENDANT: Regarding the value of the product or service.

THE COURT: What were the misrepresentations regarding

the value of the service?

THE DEFENDANT: That it had little or no value.

THE COURT: In other words, the representations were that it had value or it was a misrepresentation because it had little or no value. Is that what you are telling me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, anything else you're seeking on the allocution?

MS. FLETCHER: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Shah, when you did these acts, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and illegal?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Fletcher, what evidence does the government have against this defendant?

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, were the defendant to proceed to trial, the government anticipates that the evidence would show that between approximately 2012 and 2016, the defendant primarily acted as a lead broker responsible for selling victim information to other sales floors, that she shared in the profits that those sales floors earned when they lied to victims, and that she directed sales floors as to which so-called fulfillment services they should use, which upsell floors they should use, and how the sales should be conducted.

During this time period, the government would introduce evidence that the defendant was made aware of several

Federal Trade Commission lawsuits brought against sales floors that the defendant worked for or worked with and that alleged that these floors were engaged in deceptive practices.

The government would further show that between 2017 and 2021, in addition to acting as a lead broker, the defendant owned and operated a Manhattan-based sales floor calls Mastery Pro Group.

THE COURT: Mastery Pro Group?

MS. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor.

In that role, the defendant oversaw the sales floor herself, handled victim complaints and chargebacks, and supervised salespeople who directly lied to victims of the scheme. She was aware the government would show, through witness testimony, electronic communications, screenshots on her phone and other evidence, that the salespeople that worked for her lied to victims about their ability to make money in their home-based businesses, the value of the products that her business was selling to those victims, and other misrepresentations.

While the defendant was operating Mastery Pro Group, the government anticipates the evidence at trial would show that the defendant became aware that other individuals engaged in similar conduct, that is, operating biz-op sales floors, were criminally charged in this district.

The evidence, including electronic communications,

would show that the defendant communicated with her coconspirators about the fact of these criminal charges and that she and her coconspirators took steps to conceal the operation of Mastery Pro Group and the financial records associated with it.

She did this, and the government would show this through evidence reflecting that the defendant did not put her name on bank accounts associated with the business, and instead the bank accounts were in the names of her coconspirators or her relatives.

The financial records would further show that the defendant only received payment from Mastery Pro Group in cash, through the use of a company credit card and through payments made by the company for a New York City apartment that she lived in and/or other goods.

The evidence would show, and this would come in through cooperator testimony and electronic communications taken from electronic devices. The evidence would further show that the defendant used encrypted applications to communicate with coconspirators, that she and her coconspirators took steps to move the operation of certain aspects of the scheme offshore to Kosovo, and that she and coconspirators incorporated several businesses in Wyoming to conceal the ownership of those businesses.

Finally, the government expects that the evidence at

trial would show, and this would occur through testimony from a coconspirator and other records, that the defendant directed a coconspirator to lie under oath in a deposition taken by the Federal Trade Commission in an effort to conceal her role in the scheme and that she provided that coconspirator with written talking points that he should follow during his deposition.

As I said, your Honor, this evidence would include financial records, including records showing cash withdrawals from the Mastery Pro Group bank accounts matched to large structured cash deposits in the defendant's bank accounts, her text messages, her e-mails, screenshots of communications on her phones, communications with coconspirators, including about victims. The government anticipates that while there are thousands of victims of the scheme, several of those victims would testify at trial about the lies they were told by Mastery Pro Group salespeople acting at Ms. Shah's direction.

The government would also offer other evidence, including recordings made by coconspirators, about the scheme, lease documents from Mastery Pro Group reflecting the defendant's name, and, finally, tax returns showing that she intentionally underreported her crime proceeds by hundreds of thousands of dollars over several years in an effort to conceal her scheme.

THE COURT: Now, Ms. Fletcher, you used the term

biz-ops there, which I take it is the shorthand for business opportunities. Is that what Mastery Pro Group was foisting on the public, alleged business opportunities?

MS. FLETCHER: Yes, that's right, your Honor. As your Honor knows from having presided over this case, there are a series of different business opportunity products that are sold to customers in this space. The first service is a so-called coaching service. So the defendant primarily provided leads to coaching floors who would sell coaching to these victims.

After the individuals had been sold coaching, they would be passed along to a tax floor that would sell them business entity setup or other sort of -- what are referred to as tax products.

Finally, if the victim had purchased coaching and tax products, they would be passed along to Mastery Pro Group and sold a custom-designed website to operate their online business and so-called marketing products to advertise their business to the public.

THE COURT: I take it the position of the government is that there was no substance to the coaching tax products or website?

MS. FLETCHER: That's right, your Honor. Were this case to go to trial, the government anticipates that individuals who operated coaching floors would say that the purpose of the coaching sale was to convince the coaching buyer

that he or she needed to buy the coaching, the tax-prep products, and the marketing products that would later be sold to the customer by sales floors like the defendant's.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Shah, how do you now plead to the charge in Count One in indictment S4 19 CR 833, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty, Ms. Shah, because you are guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, do you wish any further questions on the allocution?

MS. CHAUDHRY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Government, anything further on the allocution?

MS. FLETCHER: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I now am going to sign the consent preliminary order of forfeiture in the sum of \$6,500,000. I have done that.

Ms. Shah, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged, because I find you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find your plea is

entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty of Count One of the indictment.

I'm setting the date for sentencing at October 12.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt you. We have another trial starting on October 11. If we could please ask for a date around Thanksgiving.

THE COURT: How long is that trial? Who is it before?

MS. CHAUDHRY: It's in state court, your Honor. It's at 111 Centre Street before the Honorable Sabrina Kraus. She set the date approximately three weeks ago. And I anticipate it will be approximately a three-week trial.

THE COURT: Let's do this. What's the position of the government?

MS. FLETCHER: May I have a moment, your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes, of course.

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, we would request the Court set a date, if possible, the week before Thanksgiving, which sounds like it should give defense counsel enough time with her trial.

THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, when would you like the defense sentencing submission?

THE COURT: I want them three weeks in advance of the

1 | sentencing.

MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, given that, if we could have just after Thanksgiving, in case we have posthearing briefs in our other trial.

THE COURT: Let me do this. I don't know what the likelihood of the state trial going forward is. Let me set it for October 12. If, as you come up to it, the trial is actually going to go forward, then I certainly will give you an adjournment until Thanksgiving time.

Does that make sense, Ms. Chaudhry?

MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor. I can say with a high degree of confidence that that case is going forward. We have been waiting for a trial date for five years.

THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Fletcher.

MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, perhaps in light of the conflict, the sentencing could be moved just one week earlier. I think that should still give the probation department --

THE COURT: One week earlier from October 12, you mean?

MS. FLETCHER: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think that takes care of Ms. Chaudhry's concern. Let's do it at Thanksgiving time.

Ms. Blakely. I want three weeks in advance for defense submission and two weeks in advance for the government's submission.

1 Monday, the 28th, 2:30 p.m. in this courtroom. 2 Defense submission, November 7; government's submission, November 14. 3 I take it there is no application regarding bail? 4 5 MS. FLETCHER: No application, your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, you understand that you're 6 7 being released on all the conditions of release that you have 8 been on released up until now. You have to continue to abide 9 by all of the conditions of release. You understand that, 10 correct? 11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I believe you misspoke and 12 you asked if I'm aware. I think you meant Ms. Shah. 13 THE COURT: I did mean Ms. Shah. I'm sorry, 14 Ms. Chaudhry. 15 Let me restate it then. 16 Ms. Shah, I am directing you to return to this 17 courtroom on the date I set for sentencing. I've granted the 18 request of your attorney, in light of a trial that she may have 19 in state court. You are not going to be remanded in the 20 interim. It's important that you continue to abide by all of 21 the conditions that you've been released on up until now. Do

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

22

23

24

25

you understand?

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you don't come to court on that date, or any adjourned date I set, you